

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project title: Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan
2. Lead agency name and address: State Water Resources Control Board
~~1001 I Street~~~~901 P Street~~
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. Contact person and phone number: ~~Chris Beegan (916) 341-5577~~~~Craig J. Wilson, (916) 657-0671~~
4. Project location: Please refer to the FED for description (Project Definition and Figure 1)
5. Project sponsor's name and address: State Water Resources Control Board
~~1001 I Street~~~~901 P Street~~
Sacramento, CA 95814
6. General plan designation: Not Applicable
7. Zoning: Not Applicable
8. Description of project: Please refer to the Project Description Section of the FED.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Please refer to the FED for description (Environmental Setting at Toxic Hot Spots)
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Office of Administrative Law (for the regulatory provisions of the Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan only)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

Environmental Impacts:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (source #: 1)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (2)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (1)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d. Affect agriculture resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (3)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low- income or minority community)? (1)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (4)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? (4)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Displace existing housing especially affordable housing? (4)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. <i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>				
a. Fault rupture? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b. Seismic ground shaking? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e. Landslides or mudflows? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
f. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill? (6)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
g. Subsidence of the land? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
h. Expansive soils? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
i. Unique geologic or physical features? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
IV. WATER. <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (6)	[]	[X]	[]	[]

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Discharge into surface water or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (6)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? (6)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e. Changes in currents or the course or direction of surface water movements? (6)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
f. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of ground water recharge capability? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
g. Altered direction or rate of flow of ground water? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
h. Impacts to ground water quality? (6)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
i. Substantial reduction in the amount of ground water otherwise available for public water supplies? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (7)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (7)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? (8)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d. Create objectionable odors? (7)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. farm equipment)? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d. Insufficient parking capacity on- site or off- site? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
f. Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? (9)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
g. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicyclists racks)? (5)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Locally designated species? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? (11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? (12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. HAZARDS. <i>Would the proposal involve:</i>				
a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? (13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. NOISE. <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a. Increases in existing noise levels? (14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the proposal have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</i>				
a. Fire protection? (15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Police protection? (15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools? (15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other governmental services? (15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</i>				
a. Power or natural gas? (16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Communications systems? (16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Sewer or septic tanks? (17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Storm water drainage? (17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste disposal? (17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Local or regional water supplies? (17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Create light or glare? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a. Disturb paleontological resources? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Disturb archaeological resources? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Affect historical resources? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. RECREATION. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities? (18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (19)	[]	[X]	[]	[]
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage or long-term, environmental goals? (20)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). (21)	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (22)	[]	[]	[]	[X]

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

a. Earlier analyses used.	The SWRCB analyzed the environmental impacts of the Water Quality Control Policy for Guidance on the Development of Regional Toxic Hot Spot Cleanup Plans (SWRCB, 1998a). The impacts related to the specific definition of a toxic hot spot, ranking criteria, potential remediation activities, prevention activities, and benefits of remediation were addressed. The documents are available upon request.
b. Impacts adequately addressed.	The environmental impacts of the specific definition of a toxic hot spot, ranking criteria, remediation approaches, prevention activities, benefits of remediation, and cleanup plan contents were addressed in the earlier analysis described above. No mitigation measures were proposed because no impacts were identified.
c. Mitigation measures.	None used.

DETERMINATION

Based on the evaluation in the FED (Potential Adverse Environmental Effects Section), I find that SWRCB adoption of the proposed Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

~~April 2, 1999~~
August 29, 2003
Date

Stanley M. Martinson, Chief
Division of Water Quality
State Water Resources Control Board

Attachment to CEQA Environmental Checklist

1. (I.a., c., e.) General plans and zoning delineate those areas that will be developed, and the type and density of development to be allowed. There is nothing in the proposed Plan that requires the property in the area of remediation activities to be used in any way.
2. (I.b.) The proposed Plan provides that remediation activities will occur within existing local, State, and Federal laws and policies. It does not impose new regulatory requirements that would cause conflicts with existing plans or policies.
3. (I.d.) Remediation of toxic hot spots would not cause impacts to soils or farmlands or create incompatible uses. Any needed source reduction of pesticides would be consistent with the existing SWRCB/RWQCB framework for reducing nonpoint sources which is best achieved through the cooperative efforts of the dischargers, other interested parties, and the SWRCB and RWQCBs; and the Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Pesticide Regulation.
4. (II. a.,b.,c.) See discussion of growth-inducing impacts.
5. (III.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,g.,h.,i.; IV.b.,f.,g.,i.; VI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,g.; IX.b.,c.,e.; XIII.a.,b.,c.; XIV.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.): See discussion of potential impacts of constructing or modifying publicly owned wastewater or industrial treatment facilities.
6. (III.f.;IV.a.,c.,d.,e.,h.) See discussion of potential impacts to water resources.
7. (V.a.,b.,d.) See discussion of potential impacts to air quality, and exposure to hazards.
8. (V.c.) There is no evidence that remediation of toxic hot spots significantly impacts temperature, humidity, precipitation, winds, cloudiness, or other atmospheric conditions.
9. (VI.f.) See discussion of potential impacts to waterborne traffic.
10. (VII.a.,b.,c.,e.) See discussion of potential impacts to biological resources.
11. (VII.d.) See discussion of potential impacts to water resources (including wetlands).
12. (VIII.a.,b.,c.) There is no evidence that remediation would conflict with any energy conservation plans, use resources in a wasteful manner, or result in loss of a known mineral resource.
13. (IX.a.,d.) See discussion of potential hazards.

14. (X.a.,b.) See discussion of noise impacts.
15. (XI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.) Remediation of toxic hot spots will not result in the need for new government services for fire or police protection, education, or maintenance of public services.
16. (XII.a.,b.,c.) Remediation of toxic hot spots would not result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to the following utilities: power or natural gas, communications, local or regional water supplies.
17. (XII.d.,e.,f.,g.) Source control for toxic hot spots could result in a need for new systems or alterations to these types of utilities and service systems. See discussion of the potential need for these systems.
18. (XV.a.,b.) Cleanup of toxic hot spots would not create additional demand for parks or recreational facilities, but would have a positive impact on existing recreational opportunities such as fishing and swimming.
19. (XVI.a.) See discussion of biological effects.
20. (XVI.b.) See discussion of cumulative impacts.
21. (XVI.c.) See discussion of cumulative impacts.
22. (XVI.d.) See discussion of potential hazards.